

**THIS IS NOT A VERBATIM TRANSCRIPTION
CITY OF CLEBURNE
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 8, 2021 MEETING**

The Planning and Zoning Commission (P&Z) of the City of Cleburne held a Public Hearing on Monday, February 8, 2021, at 6:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers of City Hall located at 10 N. Robinson. Planning and Zoning Commission meetings are open to the public with social distancing protocols in place.

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

Dena Day – Chairwoman
Albert Archer, Sr. – Vice-Chairman
Vance Castles
Robert Walker
Sonny Albertson
Summerly Sherlock

CITY STAFF PRESENT:

Danielle Castillo, Planning Manager
David Jellen, Planner
Laura Melton, Asst. Director of Public Works
Colt Friedrich, Project Engineer
Bradley Anderle, City Attorney

COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:

Chris Saunders

MEETING FORMAT:

Mr. Anderle, Mrs. Castillo, Mr. Jellen and Ms. Melton were present at the meeting in the Council Chambers.

Mr. Friedrich tuned into the meeting remotely.

Chairwoman Day, Vice-Chairman Archer, Commissioner Walker, Commissioner Castles and Commissioner Albertson were present at the meeting in the Council Chambers.

Commissioner Sherlock tuned into the meeting remotely.

CALL TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order by Chairwoman Day at 6:30 p.m. It was established that a quorum was present.

CITIZEN COMMENTS:

There were no citizen comments at this meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The minutes of the January 25, 2021 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting were considered.

Vice-Chairman Archer made a motion to approve the minutes of the January 25, 2021 meeting and the motion was seconded by Commissioner Albertson. **The motion to approve the minutes carried by a vote of 6-0.**

SECTION I: ZONING:

CONSIDER A REQUEST TO REZONE ±0.30 ACRES FROM SF-4 (SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING DISTRICT) TO MF (MULTIPLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT), LOCATED AT 1121 PRAIRIE AVENUE, AS REQUESTED BY MIKE AND RHONDA HARPER, **CASE ZC21-001**

David Jellen, Planner, presented the case and briefed the Commission on the request. The applicant, Mike Harper, was present to brief the Commission on the request.

Vice-Chairman Archer questioned the applicant regarding his plans for the property.

Mr. Harper responded that he wanted to add a second unit to the property.

Chairwoman Day questioned staff regarding the size of the lot and whether a second unit would be able to fit on the lot with the existing unit.

Danielle Castillo, Planning Manager, responded that the applicant would need to provide a survey of the lot in order to determine the actual dimensions of the lot. She stated that the proposed development would need to meet all of the regulations in the Zoning Ordinance.

Chairwoman Day stated that the proposed rezoning request did not fit in with the existing single-family character of the neighborhood.

Mr. Harper stated there was an existing duplex dwelling located across the street from the subject property.

Commissioner Walker stated that the proposed rezoning request could allow for the development of more units in the future if the property owner decided to sell the property. He questioned the applicant if he had considered subdividing the property.

Mr. Harper responded that it was his intent to build a second single-family home on the property.

Commissioner Castles questioned the applicant for clarification regarding his development plans.

Mr. Harper stated that the existing house would remain on the property and that a second home would be built facing Walnut Street in the rear of the property.

Commissioner Albertson questioned the applicant if the property would be a rental property.

Mr. Harper responded that it would be.

Commissioner Albertson questioned staff if the rezoning request would be needed given the applicant's plans for development.

Mrs. Castillo responded that the Zoning Ordinance allows one dwelling unit per lot in the SF-4 (Single-Family Dwelling District). She stated that when discussing this information with the applicant, the MF (Multiple-Family Housing District) is the only district that allows multiple dwellings on a single lot.

Vice-Chairman Archer questioned staff if the rezoning request would be needed if the applicant platted the property and had it subdivided into two (2) lots.

Mrs. Castillo responded that staff had estimated the size of the property to be roughly 0.30 acres or 13,068 square feet, based on the information provided from the Johnson County Appraisal District's website and had determined that it was not large enough to be subdivided

into two (2) lots. She explained that the minimum lot size requirement in the SF-4 District is 7,000 square feet.

Commissioner Albertson questioned staff if the lot could be considered an infill lot.

Mrs. Castillo explained that the infill lot program applies specifically to lots that were platted prior to March of 1996 and that the subject property would not qualify as an infill lot given that it had not been previously platted.

Commissioner Walker stated that rezoning the property would be inappropriate for the existing character of the neighborhood.

Mr. Harper stated that his options were to rezone the property or to try to subdivide it into two (2) lots.

Vice-Chairman Archer stated that the better option would be to have a survey done to determine the lot dimensions and then to try to subdivide the lot.

Mr. Harper stated that he thought that the lot would be big enough to subdivide.

Chairwoman Day responded that any proposed development would need to meet all of the other regulations in the Zoning Ordinance.

Chairwoman Day opened the public hearing.

Concerned Citizen, Michael Petty, stated his opposition to the proposed rezoning request. He stated that multiple-family development would not fit the character of the existing neighborhood.

Chairwoman Day closed the public hearing.

There being no other questions or items for discussion, Chairwoman Day called for a motion. Commissioner Castles made a motion to deny the request as presented and Vice-Chairman Archer seconded the motion. **The motion to deny carried by a vote of 6-0.**

CONSIDER A REQUEST TO REZONE ±5.3 ACRES FROM C3 (COMMERCIAL DISTRICT) TO PD (PLANNED DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT), LOCATED AT 1610 NORTH MAIN STREET, AS REQUESTED BY 1600 ENTERPRISES, LTD, REPRESENTED BY VLK ARCHITECTS, CASE ZC20-029

Danielle Castillo, Planning Manager, presented the case and briefed the Commission on the request.

Chairwoman Day questioned staff regarding the proposed zero (0) foot setback along the northern property line.

Mrs. Castillo responded that the C3 (Commercial District) permits a zero (0) foot setback along the property line of two (2) properties that are both zoned C3. She clarified that the proposed zero (0) setback would not deviate from the current setback requirement.

Commissioner Albertson questioned staff if the entire development would be managed by a single entity.

Mrs. Castillo responded that the development would be managed by a single entity.

Commissioner Albertson questioned staff if the development would need to be replatted if the applicant decided to sell a portion of the development in the future.

Mrs. Castillo responded that the lot would need to be replatted if the applicant decided to subdivide the property in the future.

Commissioner Albertson questioned staff if there would be any assigned parking spaces for the residents of the multi-family portion of the development.

Mrs. Castillo responded that the applicant would be able to address the question.

Vice-Chairman Archer questioned staff regarding the screening requirements that would be applicable for the subject property.

Mrs. Castillo explained that the development does not have any screening requirements due to the separation of the subject property from the existing residences by Ramsey Street.

Vice-Chairman Archer questioned staff regarding the rehabilitation of the existing building on the subject property.

Mrs. Castillo responded that the applicant would be able to address the question.

The applicant, Tom Crew, was present to brief the Commission on the request. Present remotely with the applicant was the architect on the project, Michael Antenora.

Mr. Crew stated that the existing building had been cleaned and rehabilitated per state and federal standards.

Vice-Chairman Archer questioned the applicant if a structural engineer had evaluated the existing building.

Mr. Crew responded that a structural engineer had evaluated the existing building and that it had passed the examination.

Commissioner Castles questioned the applicant regarding his timeframe for the renovation and conversion of the existing building, as well as for the addition to the building.

Mr. Crew responded that the renovation and addition to the existing building would be done concurrently with the construction of the other buildings on the subject property.

Vice-Chairman Archer questioned the applicant regarding the multi-family portion of the development.

Mr. Crew responded that the multi-family portion of the development would be entirely senior housing. He explained that the storage building would mainly consist of air-conditioned units with masonry-finished exteriors.

Vice-Chairman Archer questioned the applicant if any of the parking spaces would be covered.

Mr. Antenora responded that it had not yet been decided if covered parking would be provided. He stated that any covered parking spaces would be designated for the residents of the multiple-family portion of the development.

Chairwoman Day questioned the applicant regarding the tenants of the proposed retail space.

Mr. Crew responded that they would be targeting retail uses that would be appropriate with the overall development. He noted that a laundromat would be one of the uses in the building.

Chairwoman Day requested that the applicant propose specific uses that would be allowed or restricted from the proposed retail building in order to better serve the overall development.

Mr. Antenora responded that the targeted services would be supplementary to the development.

Mr. Crew responded that he would put together a list of proposed uses that would either be allowed or restricted within the retail space.

Chairwoman Day questioned the applicant regarding the proposed building facades and the materials that would be used to construct the new buildings.

Mr. Antenora responded that he would come back with elevations for all of the proposed buildings.

Chairwoman Day questioned the applicant if pets would be allowed in the proposed multiple-family portion of the development.

Mr. Crew responded that pet-friendly apartments were not being considered at this time.

Chairwoman Day requested that it be included in the final ordinance that no pet-friendly apartments would be allowed. She stated that any proposed plans would need to show dedicated green space for pets if pet-friendly apartments were being considered.

Mr. Antenora responded that they would consider whether or not pet-friendly apartments would be added to the proposal and that they would show any dedicated green space as necessary.

Vice-Chairman Archer responded that the current submitted plans made it difficult to determine the exact amount of green space that was being proposed.

Chairwoman Day requested that the applicant update their submittal with proposed green space locations and design, elevations, lighting and security.

Mr. Antenora responded that each of the items would be included with the site plan submittal for the development.

Vice-Chairman Archer questioned the applicant if any of the multiple-family units would include patios.

Mr. Antenora responded that they would and that the roof of the amenity building would include a garden area.

Vice-Chairman Archer questioned the applicant if he would include more details about the apartment units themselves.

Mr. Antenora responded that he would provide the proposed unit layouts.

Chairwoman Day questioned the applicant if there would be a workout facility included in the amenity building.

Mr. Crew responded that there would be a workout facility included in the amenity building.

Mr. Antenora stated that each of the proposed amenities had been included with the submittal for the proposed amenity building.

Commissioner Albertson questioned the applicant if each unit would have a laundry washer and dryer.

Mr. Crew responded that each unit would have a hookup for a washer and dryer.

Commissioner Albertson questioned the applicant if the proposed restaurant building would be owned or leased.

Mr. Antenora responded that it depends on the client.

Commissioner Castles questioned the applicant if the estimated completion date would be in the year 2022.

Mr. Crew responded that he thought it would be completed by the end of 2022.

Chairwoman Day opened the public hearing.

Concerned Citizen, Phillip Jackson, 110 Rosedale, questioned the Commission about whether there would be any grade changes that would affect the development.

Chairwoman Day stated that any drainage issues would be resolved with the Engineering Department.

Chairwoman closed the public hearing.

There being no other questions or items for discussion, Chairwoman Day made a motion to continue the public hearing and table the item to the February 22, 2021 Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting. Vice-Chairman Archer seconded the motion. **The motion to continue the public hearing and table the item to the February 22, 2021 Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting carried by a vote of 6-0.**

SECTION II: OTHER BUSINESS:

Update on actions taken by the City Council at their last meeting on Planning and Zoning Cases:

- i. ZC20-028 – Monarca Rezone – M1 to MF

Mrs. Castillo briefed the Commission on actions taken by the City Council at the January 26, 2021 meeting on the above listed Planning and Zoning cases.

THERE BEING NO OTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 8:06 PM.